

REMARKS

The Applicants thank the Examiner for the thorough consideration given the present application. Claims 1-25 are pending. Claims 20, and 21 are amended. Claims 1, 13, 17, 20, and 21 are independent. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider the rejections in view of the amendments and remarks set forth herein.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 101

Claims 21 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as failing to recite computer executable instructions. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

While not conceding the appropriateness of the Examiner's rejections, but merely to advance prosecution of the instant application, the Applicants respectfully submit that independent claim 21 has been amended to recite "a computer-readable recording medium having computer-executable instructions which, when executed on a computer, comprising...".

The Applicants respectfully submit that independent method claim 21, as amended, recites a positive functional interrelationship between the medium and the activities recited. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) and §103(a)

Claims 20 and 21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Parulski et al. (U.S. 6,573,927); and

claims 1-19 and 22-25 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Parulski in view of Tate (U.S. 7,069,237). These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Arguments Regarding Independent Claims 20 and 21

While not conceding the appropriateness of the Examiner's rejection, but merely to advance the prosecution of the present application, independent claim 20 has been amended to recite a combination of steps directed to a method for executing a program in an order terminal, including *inter alia*

reading ... access information indicating a plurality of specific photograph processing agencies available to access an order reception server installed in each of said specific photographic processing agencies ...; and

transferring the order information from the order terminal to said order reception server installed in a specific one of said specific photograph processing agencies by directly accessing the order reception server according to said access information.

In addition, independent claim 21 has been amended to recite a combination of elements directed to a computer recording medium, including *inter alia*

... access information indicating a plurality of specific photograph processing agencies available to access an order reception server installed in each of said specific photograph processing agencies,

... order information to said order reception server installed in a specific one of said specific photograph processing agencies by directly accessing the order reception server according to said access information.

The Applicants respectfully submit that the combination of features as set forth in each of independent claims 20 and 21 is not disclosed or made obvious by the prior art of record, including Parulski et al.

On page 5 of the Office Action, the Examiner concedes that Parulski et al. fail to explicitly disclose a plurality of photograph agencies and a plurality of reception servers, as is required by each of independent claims 20 and 21, as amended herein.

At least for the reasons explained above, the Applicants respectfully submit that the combination of features as set forth in each of independent claims 20 and 21 is not disclosed or made obvious by the prior art of record, including Parulski et al.

Therefore, independent claims 20 and 21 are in condition for allowance.

Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) are respectfully requested.

Arguments Regarding Independent Claims 1, 13, and 17 as Previously Presented

While not conceding the appropriateness of the Examiner's rejection, but merely to advance the prosecution of the present application, independent claim 1 as previously presented recites a combination of elements in a print order system including *inter alia*

an order terminal directly connectable via the network to each of the order reception servers in the plurality of photograph processing agencies, the order terminal generating the order information and placing an order for a print of the image data by directly transferring the order information to a corresponding one of the order reception servers installed in any

specific one of the plurality of photograph processing agencies after directly accessing the order reception server of the specific photograph processing agency.

In addition, independent claim 13 as previously presented recites a combination of elements in a printing system including *inter alia*

order reception servers enabling direct reception of order information and installed respectively in a plurality of photograph processing agencies, each having a photographic printer for outputting a print of image data; and

the order reception servers enabling direct reception of the order information from an order terminal via a network, the order information being generated by the order terminal used for placing an order for the print of the image data,

each of the order reception servers being capable of directly transferring the order information to any other order reception server in any other of the plurality of photograph processing agencies.

In addition, independent claim 17 as previously presented recites a combination of elements in an order terminal including *inter alia*

the order terminal being directly connectable via a network to each of a plurality of order reception servers in a plurality of other photographic processing agencies, the order reception servers enabling reception of order information regarding the image data, and the order terminal generating the order information and placing a print order regarding the image data by directly transferring the order information to a specific one of the order reception

servers installed in a specific one of the plurality of other photograph processing agencies after directly accessing the specific order reception server of the specific photograph processing agency.

Applicants respectfully submit that the combination of features as set forth in each of independent claims 1, 13, and 17 is not disclosed or made obvious by the prior art of record, including Parulski et al. and Tate.

On page 5 of the Office Action, the Examiner concedes that Parulski et al. fail to explicitly disclose a plurality of photograph agencies and a plurality of reception servers, time of delivery, and status of printing. The Examiner, however, then contends that Tate teaches a plurality of photograph agencies and a plurality of reception servers, time of delivery, and status of printing. However, Tate does not teach or suggest a print order system/printing system/order terminal, including “the order terminal directly accessing the order reception server installed in a specific photographic agency”, as required in independent claims 1, 13, and 17.

At least for the reasons explained above, the Applicants respectfully submit that the combination of elements/steps as set forth in each of independent claims 1, 13, and 17 is not disclosed or made obvious by the prior art of record, including Parulski et al. and Tate. Therefore, each of independent claims 1, 13, and 17 is in condition for allowance.

Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) are respectfully requested.

Application No. 10/058,280
Amendment filed March 19, 2007
Reply to Office Action of October 19, 2006

Docket No. 2091-0249P
Art Unit: 3627
Page 16 of 17

Dependent Claims

All dependent claims are in condition for allowance due to their dependence on allowable independent claims, or due to the additional features set forth therein.

CONCLUSION

Since the remaining patents cited by the Examiner have not been utilized to reject claims, but merely to show the state of the art, no comment need be made with respect thereto.

All of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action, and that the present application is in condition for allowance.

If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, he is invited to telephone Carl T. Thomsen (Reg. No. 50,786) at (703) 208-4030 (direct line).

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§1.16 or 1.17, particularly extension of time fees.

Respectfully submitted,

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP

By 

Marc S. Weiner
Reg. No. 32,181
P. O. Box 747
Falls Church, VA 22040-0747
(703) 205-8000


MSW/CTT/ktp